

REMARKS

Claims 17-40 are pending in this application. Claims 17-40 were rejected. Claims 17, 30 and 37 have been amended. Claim 23 has been canceled without prejudice. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections

Claims 17-20, 30-31, 34-35, and 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tashiro (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0196393).

Claims 23-24 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tashiro in view of Fukami (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,208).

Claims 17, 30 and 37 are amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 23.

It is respectfully submitted that at the very minimum, the combination of Tashiro and Fukami is legally deficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in claims 17, 30 and 37. For instance, the combination does not teach or suggest “a storage electrode connection overlapping a sealant and a black matrix”, as essentially claimed in claims 17, 30 and 37.

The Office Action admits that Tashiro does not disclose “a plurality of storage electrode lines overlapping the pixel electrodes”. Then, the Office Action cites Figs. 1 and 2 of Fukami as disclosing, “storage electrode lines overlapping pixel electrodes to form additional storage capacitance.”

Applicants respectfully disagree. Fukami does not disclose or suggest a plurality of storage electrode lines overlapping pixel electrodes, much less “a *storage electrode connection overlapping a sealant and a black matrix*”, as essentially claimed in claims 17, 30 and 37. Fukami only shows a storage capacitance formed by the overlapping of a pixel electrode (3) with a common electrode (4). (See Figs. 1A, 1B and 2 of Fukami).

Therefore, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Tashiro and Fukami are combined, the combination does not disclose or suggest “a *storage electrode connection overlapping a sealant and a black matrix*”, as essentially claimed in claims 17, 30 and 37.

Claims 18-20, 24 and 29 depend from claim 17, claims 31 and 34-35 depend from claim 30, and claims 38-40 depend from claim 37. These dependent claims are believed to be patentable over the combination of Tashiro and Fukami for at least the same reasons given above for respective base claims 17, 30 and 37.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 24 is allowable for additional reasons. For instance, the combination of Tashiro and Fukami does not teach or suggest “a *common electrode connection overlapping a sealant and a black matrix*”, as essentially claimed in claim 24.

Fukami does not disclose or even remotely suggest a common electrode connection, much less a common electrode connection overlapping a sealant and a black matrix.

Therefore, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Tashiro and Fukami are combined, the combination does not disclose or suggest “a common electrode connection overlapping a sealant and a black matrix”, as essentially claimed in claim 24.

Claims 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tashiro in view of Moon (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0067428). Claims 25-28 depend from claim 17. These dependent claims are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons given above for the allowable base claim 17.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 25 is allowable for additional reasons. For instance, the combination of Tashiro and Moon does not teach or suggest “a conductive member comprising a connector transmitting signals between a data PCB and a gate PCB and overlapping a sealant and a black matrix”, as essentially claimed in claim 25.

The Office Action admits that Tashiro does not disclose “a gate PCB and a data PCB for supplying signals to first and second panels”. Then, the Office Action cites Fig. 1 of Moon as disclosing, “a gate PCB (4) and a data PCB (6) for supplying signals to first and second signals.” Although Moon discloses a gate PCB (4) and a data PCB (6), Moon does not cure deficiencies of Tashiro because Moon does not disclose or even remotely suggest a connector transmitting signals between a data PCB and a gate PCB. Even assuming that data TCP (10) or gate TCP (14) is a connector, the data TCP (10) or gate TCP (14) does not overlap a sealant and a black matrix. (See, Fig. 1 of Moon).

Therefore, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Tashiro and Moon are combined, the combination does not disclose or suggest “a *conductive member comprising a connector transmitting signals between a data PCB and a gate PCB and overlapping a sealant and a black matrix*”, as essentially claimed in claim 25.


Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tashiro in view of Kim (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0036086). Claim 21 and 22 depend upon claim 17. These dependent claims are believed to be patentable over Tashiro in view of Kim due to their dependency on the allowable base claim 17.

Claims 32-33 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tashiro. Claims 32-33 and 36 depend upon claim 30. These dependent claims are believed to be patentable over Tashiro due to their dependency on the allowable base claim 30.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application, including claims 17-22 and 24-40, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if he has any questions or comments in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889



Frank Chau
Reg. No. 34,136
Attorney for Applicant(s)